

REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's Office Action dated June 9, 2006 (herein, the "Office Action"), a one-month's extension of time being transmitted herewith. In that Office Action, Claims 1 – 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0086539A1 to *McCalmont, et al.* (herein "*McCalmont*").

In response to the Office Actions, Applicants hereby amend Claim 12 to correct a typographical error. Therefore, **Claims 1 – 27 are currently pending**. As set forth more fully below, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

The present invention is directed a system and method for making available information to participants in a special number call. The claimed embodiments include providing a plurality of data stores, providing at least one respective data key for accessing the information contained in each respective data store and providing communication among the participants in a plurality of data stores. Importantly, a specific call event is identified as a special number call event and an identifier code is generated that uniquely identifies the call event. The identifier code includes relational data being mappable on the at least one respective data key to effect accessing the information. The communications is used to effect cooperation by the identifier code with each respective data store for providing the information to the participants.

Claims 1 through 27 stand rejected under 35 §U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *McCalmont*. In order for rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 to be proper, each and every element as set forth in a claim must be found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. (MPEP §2131). Each and every element of the independent claims cannot be found in the cited reference. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1 through 27 are respectfully requested.

Specifically, independent claim 1 includes the limitation:

generating an identifier code for uniquely identifying said emergency service call event; said identifier code including relational data; said relational data being configured for

mapping on said at least one respective data key for effecting access to said information from each said respective data store; (Claim 1, lines 10 – 12)

It is respectfully submitted that this limitation is not disclosed or suggested in *McCalmont*. Applicants’ “identifier code” uniquely identifies an “emergency service call event.” Claim 1, line 10 and page 3, paragraph [0033]. The Examiner cites *McCalmont*, paragraph [0040] as “generating an identifier code (for example ESQK) for uniquely identifying the special number call event.” As defined in *McCalmont*, however, “ESQK” does not uniquely identify a call event. Instead, “ESQK” is defined as one of a pool of number to identify a specific call “...for the duration of the call or for some period of time slightly longer than the estimated time of the call.” *McCalmont*, Paragraph [0040] (emphasis added). Thereafter, the ESQK is returned to the pool for reuse.

In contrast, Applicants’ identifier code is defined in the Specification as a unique number or code that identifies a call event not just the call itself. Applicants’ identifier code may be used, for example, to uniquely identify the call event in “a call history database ... with the assigned [identifier code] for later treatment such as statistical evaluation, reconstruction or other historical or survey uses.” Specification, paragraph [0076]. ESQK’s cannot be used for such a purpose because each ESQK is used for more than one call event over the course of time.

Thus, an ESQK is not an equivalent to Applicants’ identifier code. Therefore, all elements of claim 1 are not found in *McCalmont* and Applicants’ claim 1 is patentable.

Claims 2 – 11 depend from allowable claim 1 are therefore allowable.

Applicants’ independent claim 12 includes a similar limitation to independent claim 1. Applicants’ claim:

generating an identifier code for uniquely identifying said emergency service call event; said identifier code including relational data; said relational data being configured for mapping on said at least one respective data key for effecting access to said information from each said respective data store;

Again, Applicants’ invention generates an identifier code that uniquely identifies a call event. As described above, *McCalmont* does not disclose or suggest an identifier code that

uniquely identifies a call event. Thus, Applicants' independent claim 12 is patentable over the prior art.

Claims 13 – 18 depend from allowable claim 12, and are likewise allowable.

Claim 19 also includes a limitation to an identifying unit that “generat[es] an identifier code for uniquely identifying said special number call event.” As argued above, there is no teaching or suggestion of such a unique identifier code in *McCalmont*. Thus, claim 19 is patentable.

Claim 20 – 27 depend from claim 19 and are therefore patentable.

The application now appearing to be in form for allowance, early notification of same is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if doing so would expedite the resolution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Michael B. Johannesen/  
Michael B. Johannesen, Reg. No. 35,557  
Intrado  
1601 Dry Creek Drive  
Longmont, Colorado 80503  
Telephone: (630) 430-1502 or  
(630) 300-2727

Date: September 26, 2006